

REMARKS

Claims **1-21** and **23-37** are pending.

Claims **1-21** and **23-37** stand rejected.

Claims **1-21** and **23-37** have been amended. No new matter has been added. Support for the amendments these claims can be found, at least, within paragraphs [0020] and [0021] of the specification.

Claims **39** has been added.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-21 and 23-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as purportedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,804,657 (“Sultan”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,516,106 (“Ehlers”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that Sultan and Ehlers, alone or in any combination, fail to teach or suggest, all the elements of independent claim 1, including at the very least, (1) generating a plurality of forecast snapshots, where each forecast snapshot of the plurality of forecast snapshots comprises (a) a forecast, and (b) forecast summary information for the forecast; (2) storing such forecast snapshots; (3) retrieving a stored forecast snapshot, where the stored forecast snapshot is one of the plurality of forecast snapshots; and (4) displaying forecast information for the stored forecast snapshot, where the forecast information comprises a forecast for the stored forecast snapshot and forecast summary information for that forecast. Independent claims 16 and 32 recite comparable limitations.

As an initial matter, Ehlers (correctly) is not cited as disclosing any features that might somehow be related to the claimed forecast snapshot, and is therefore not relevant to the amended limitations related to forecast snapshots. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that no such disclosure is, in fact, provided by Ehlers.

The Office Action cites Sultan as purportedly teaching the claimed generating a forecast snapshot comprising both (a) a forecast, and (b) forecast summary information for the forecast. *See* Office Action, p. 12 (citing Sultan 10:5-50). Applicants respectfully submit that, notwithstanding any other distinctions, a fundamental distinction between Sultan and the claimed

invention is Sultan's aggregate sales forecast and the claimed forecast snapshot, and more specifically, the point at which the claimed summary information within the forecast snapshot is generated. Sultan calculates its aggregate for display at the point at which the aggregate is to be displayed. This clearly demonstrates that Sultan fails to show, teach or suggest the claimed forecast snapshot - particularly one that includes both a forecast and forecast summary information for the forecast that are determined when the forecast snapshot is generated.

Sultan generates its aggregate forecasting information for display from a forecast when the aggregate information is to be displayed, which is well after any given forecast is created. Sultan generates such information at this later time by definition, as it must, given that the such aggregate forecasting information is intended to be real-time (and thus should be generated as close to the time of display as possible). By contrast, the claimed forecast snapshot comprises summary information for a forecast that is generated at the time that the forecast snapshot is created, and the forecast snapshot is created before information from the forecast snapshot is stored, and subsequently retrieved and displayed. This basic difference can be explained by the fact that Sultan does not store any summary information; Sultan only stores a forecast – leaving forecasting information generated from the forecast to be generated afterward, when the forecast information is to be displayed.

The cited table in Sultan includes a "Total" column, which is the total amount of forecast revenue for Widgets1 and Widgets2, combined. *See* Sultan 10:45-50. However, the paragraph before the table indicates that the information in the table is generated after accessing the sales forecast/pipeline information stored in Sultan's database. In other words, the information in the "Total" column is calculated after accessing the individual pieces of information regarding the widgets.

By contrast, the pertinent claim limitations recite that when a forecast snapshot is generated, the forecast snapshot includes both forecast information and forecast summary information. Thus, the claimed invention generates the forecast summary information when the forecast snapshot is generated, and so does not determine the claimed forecast summary information at the time the forecast snapshot is requested. By contrast, because Sultan does not store any forecast summary information when the forecast is created, Sultan's method processes its forecasting information at the point in time when the forecasting information is retrieved for display.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that neither Sultan nor Ehlers, alone or in combination, provide disclosure of all the limitations of independent claims 1, 16, and 32, and all claims depending therefrom, including new claim 39, and that these claims are in condition for allowance. Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections to these claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that all claims are now in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

If any extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) are required in order for this submission to be considered timely, Applicants hereby petition for such extensions. Applicants also hereby authorize that any fees due for such extensions or any other fee associated with this submission, as specified in 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17, be charged to deposit account 502306.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Samuel G. Campbell III /

Samuel G. Campbell III
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 42,381
512-439-5084 (direct)
512-439-5099 (fax)